UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/528,794	03/23/2005	Osamu Ishigami	SHM-15962	9163
	7590 01/07/201 L & CLARK LLP	EXAMINER		
38210 Glenn A	venue	ROE, JESSEE RANDALL		
WILLOUGHBY, OH 44094-7808			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1793	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/07/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Applicant(s)	
ISHIGAMI ET AL.	
Art Unit	
1793	
	ISHIGAMI ET AL. Art Unit

	JESSEE ROE	1793	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appear	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 30 December 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance	, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 5 months from the mailing date of this Ac no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b) MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth inter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing op. ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE (b).	date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FIL	n. .ED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extender 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the slipset forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origin	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b (a) They raise new issues that would require further con (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a c	sideration and/or search (see NOT v); er form for appeal by materially rec	E below); lucing or simplifying th	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowed non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	bwable if submitted in a separate, t will not be entered, or b) ⊠ will	imely filed amendmer	it canceling the
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1.4-7 and 9. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but	before or on the date of filing a No	otice of Appeal will not	be entered
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	sufficient reasons why the affidavi	t or other evidence is	necessary and
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to ov showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	ll and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•	
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.		condition for allowand	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (l13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Roy King/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1793			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments filed 30 Novmeber 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

First, the Applicant primarily argues that the thermal drying process carried out at 100 to 200 degrees Celsius has an effect of drying the stainless steel by vaporizing washing water adhered to a passivated coating film on a surface of the stainless steel and also an effect of stabilizing the passivated coating film on the surface of the stainless steel and thus improving the corrosion resistance of the stainless steel and these advantageous effects are evidenced by lower corrosion densities shown in Figure 3 of the present application and not shown or taught by any of the cited references.

In response, the Examiner notes that the Applicant has not distinguished the criticality of the drying temperature within the range of 100 to 200 degrees Celsius since, according to Figure 3, the corrosion current would unexpected and significantly different from 100 and 200 degrees Celsius at temperatures of 99 degrees Celsius and 201 degrees Celsius. MPEP 716.02(b).

Second, the Applicant primarily argues that the bubbling technique shown in JP '990 relies on vapor bubbles produced by cavitation and impingement of the cavitation vapor bubbles on a surface of a treated object or work surface to increase an electric potential of the work surface to thereby form a passivated coating film on the work surface. The Applicant further argues that vapor bubbles produced by cavitation do not increase the amount of oxygen dissolved in the liquid, as required by claim 1 and the air bubbling shon in Kovacs ('663) is not conducted during a passivation treatment but done before the passivation treatment for adjusting a pH of a treatment solution and there is no motivation to substitute the cavitation vapor bubbling as taught by JP '990 with the air-bubbling as taught by Kovacs ('663).

In response, the Examiner notes that Kovacs ('663) teaches a process for passivating stainless steel wherein external air/oxygen bubbling can be utilized to improve passivation and one having ordinary skill in the art would have realized that both air bubbling by cavitation as taught by JP '990 and external air/oxygen bubbling by Kovacs ('663) perform the same function of aiding or improving passivation film formation on stainless steel surfaces. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found substitution of air bubbling by cavitation, as taught by JP '990 with external air/oxygen bubbling, as taught by Kovacs ('663) an expected success of improved passivation film formation.

Third, the Applicant primarily argues that none of the cited references describe the particular drying process now recited in claim 5 as amended.

In response, one having ordinary skill in the art would have it obvious to have varied the drying temperature in the process of JP '990 in view of Kovacs ('663) via routine optimization in order to achieve the desired coating drying speed since the drying temperature directly affects how fast the passive layer becomes dry. MPEP 2144.05 II.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jessee Roe whose telephone number is (571)272-5938. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday and alternate Fridays 7:00 AM - 4:00 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy V. King can be reached on (571) 272-1244. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/JR/